



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*[Signature]*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/779,095

02/08/2001

Jean-Louis Gueret

20982-13

1674

22852

7590

06/22/2007

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP

901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

GHALI, ISIS A D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1615

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/22/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/779,095	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GUERET, JEAN-LOUIS	
	<b>Examiner</b> Isis A. Ghali	<b>Art Unit</b> 1615	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-30 and 35-68 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-30 and 35-68 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)<br>2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)<br>3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____<br>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)<br>6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
|--|--|

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The receipt is acknowledged of applicant's amendment filed 03/26/2007.

Claims 2-4, 31-34 have been canceled, and claims 66-68 have been added.

Claims 1, 5-30, 35-68 are pending and included in the prosecution.

**The following rejections have been overcome by virtue of applicant's amendment and remarks:**

(A) The rejection of claims 11, 21-23 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

**The following new ground of rejection is necessitated by applicant's amendment:**

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 66-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

Art Unit: 1615

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The newly added claims 66-68 recite the limitation "substantially constant thickness". Recourse to the specification does not disclose anywhere that the composite has substantially constant thickness. In paragraph 0022 of the published application, applicant disclosed that: "These two support layers can be of different roughnesses, porosities, or thicknesses so as to make two different types of application possible depending on which face is selected by the user." In paragraph 0062 applicant disclosed: "The support layers 12 and 13 can be of different thicknesses." In paragraph 0077 applicant disclosed: "The composite structure 40 of the embodiment shown in FIG. 4 comprises an adhesive matrix 41 sandwiched between two support layers 42 and 43 respectively constituted by a polyethylene film having a thickness of 40 micrometers (.mu.m) and by a hydrophilic non-woven cloth with a weight per surface area of 40 g/m.sup.2, made up of a mixture of polypropylene and viscose fibers". In paragraph 0085 applicant disclosed: "FIG. 7 shows a composite structure 70 comprising an adhesive matrix 71 sandwiched between support layers 72 and 73 of different thickness". Therefore, no disclosure whatsoever in the specification for "composite that has substantially constant thickness". In accordance to MPEP 714.02, applicant should specifically point out to where in the disclosure a support for any amendment made to the claims can be found.

**The following rejections are discussed in the previous office action and are maintained for reasons of record:**

3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a written description rejection. Claim 9 is directed to moisture absorbing compounds including "freeze-dried substances". The specification gives no guidance to one of ordinary skill in the art regarding "freeze-dried substances" that fulfill the requirement as moisture absorbing compounds. The disclosure of the broad expression "freeze-dried substances" without partial or complete description of any freeze-dried substances does not convey to one of ordinary skill in the art that applicants were in possession of the claimed subject matter. The recitation of "freeze-dried substances" without any description of these substances and their correlation to the moisture absorbing compounds does not meet the written description requirement as one of ordinary skill in the art could not recognize or understand the what are the freeze dried materials that acts as moisture absorbing compounds. Claims employing broad terms at the point of novelty, such as applicants', neither provide those elements required to practice the inventions, nor "inform the public" during the life of the patent of the limits of the monopoly asserted. The expression could encompass myriad of freeze-dried substances and applicants claimed "freeze-dried substances" represents only an invitation to experiment regarding possible means.

To satisfy the Written description requirement, applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to one skilled in the art, as of the filing date that applicant were in possession of the claimed invention. *Vas-Cathy Inc. v Mahurkar*, 19 USPQ 2d 1111. The invention is, for purpose of the "written description" inquiry, what ever is now claimed.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 03/26/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that there is no reasonable basis to challenge the adequacy of written description of the term "freeze dried substances" in the context of moisture absorbing compounds, and the Examiner has not demonstrated by a preponderance of evidence why person skilled in the art would not recognize the description of the invention defined by the claims.

In response to this argument, it is pointed out to the scope of claim 9 that encompasses all substances that can be freeze dried, because the claim reads as " the moisture absorbing substance includes freeze dried substances". Nowhere in the specification applicant has disclosed freeze-dried substances that suitable as moisture absorbing agents. Are these substances one of those moisture-absorbing substances listed in the claims, or other substances? One skilled in the art would not recognize the freeze-dried substances that can be used in the present invention as defined by the claims. Applicants are not in possession to, as of the filing date of the claims, "freeze

Art Unit: 1615

dried substances" and not informing the public during the life of the patent of the limits of the monopoly asserted.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 14, 36-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 14, the recitation of "vinyl", which is a chemical group, as an adhesive does not set forth the metes and bounds of the claim. Recourse to the specification disclosed adhesives comprise vinyl.

Regarding claims 36-40, the claims recite the expressions: "additional active agent configured to swell", "additional active agent soluble in the solvent", "compounds configured to swell". Recourse to the specification does not define the expressions.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 03/26/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues there is no ambiguity as to the meaning and scope of the term "vinyl" in the context of adhesive matrices as claimed by claim 14, and one of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand the scope of "vinyl" as a component of an adhesive matrix. Applicants are referring to page 2, and page 14 for support for "additional active agent" and "compounds configured to swell" claimed by claims 36-40.

Art Unit: 1615

In response to this argument, it is argued that the term "vinyl" is ambiguous as what the term is defined as, is it chemical vinyl group, monomer, polymer, copolymer, or vinyl compounds, etc. One having ordinary skill in the art would not understand the scope of the term "vinyl" in absence of definition from the specification to the metes and bounds of the term.

Regarding claims 36-40, the recitation of "additional active agent" is determined by the function of "such that the adhesive matrix loses cohesion on contact to solvent", however, in page 2, lines 17-21, applicant disclosed that: "the adhesive matrix contains a filler of one or more substantially inert compounds in sufficient quantity for the matrix to lose its cohesion on contact with the solvent". Therefore, the specification does not define the active agents such that the adhesive matrix loses cohesion on contact with the solvent, but inert compounds. In the same way, applicant disclosed: "filler and compounds capable of swelling on contact with solvent" and not "additional active agent configured to swell on contact with solvent".

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.



Art Unit: 1615

9. Claims 1, 5-11, 14-18, 27, 36-42, 47-52, 54-57, 59, 60, 65-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,491,928 ('928).

The present claims 1, 54-56 are drawn to article comprising two non-adhesive layers, at least one of these layers is permeable to a solvent, and an adhesive layer disposed between the two non-adhesive layers and comprises adhesive and active agent that can be delivered upon wetting of the article. Claim 27 is directed to conventional method of making the article that comprises the steps of coating the composition comprising the adhesive on the first non-adhesive layer, and then assembling the second non-adhesive layer.

US '928 teaches an article comprising first substrate and second substrate and a therapeutic composition disposed in between the two substrates (abstract; figure 3). The first substrate is perforated and made of permeable materials to enable passage of water (col.3, lines 50-66). The second substrate is can be apertures (col.9, lines 35-40). The therapeutic composition comprises active agent including the agents recited by claim 11 including conditioning agents, anti-acne, anti-wrinkles, anti-inflammatory, etc. (col. 25, lines 25-35). The substrates layers are made of non-woven material and can be permeable to water, as required by claims 15 and 16, or impermeable, as required by claim 18 (col.3, lines 64-67; col.4, lines 13-16; col.5, lines 23-25). The two non-adhesive substrates can have different texture, as required by claim 17 (col.3, lines 39-46). The active agent is released from the article when the article is wetted with water and contacted the hair or skin as required by the generic claims, and claims 5, 6, 47-49, 65 (col. 44, lines 13-31). The therapeutic agent comprised within composition

Art Unit: 1615

comprising adhesive material (col. 31, lines 21-25). The therapeutic composition comprises cellulose or starches that are claimed by applicant as moisture absorbing compounds in claims 7 and 9 (col.36, lines 9-11; col. 37, lines 1-2). The reference also teaches gelling agents that also read on moisture absorbing agents and it is present in an amount of 0.1 to 100% that encompasses the amounts claimed in claims 8 and 42 (col.36, lines 18-25). The gelling agents are capable to form a hydrogel and absorb water, and that reads on the limitations of claims 36-41. The reference teaches a method of making the article comprises the steps of adding the therapeutic composition to the first substrate then placing the second substrate on the first substrate as required by claim 27 (col.43, lines 65-67; col.4, lines 1-2). The therapeutic composition comprises polyamides claimed by applicants as inert materials in claim 10 (col.43, line 59). The reference teaches that the different active agents can be enclosed separate from one another (col.19, lines 60-65).

The set forth teaching of the reference meet the requirements of generic claims 1, 27, 54-56, and the dependent claims included in the rejection, except for the limitation that the two non-adhesive substrates are bonded permanently by the middle layer. It is notices that the adhesive used by the reference in the middle layer comprises acrylic polymer and polyurethane that are claimed by applicant as permanent adhesive in claim 14 (col.32, lines 40-43; col.37, lines col.39, lines 16-17). Hence, the middle layer disclosed by the reference that comprises adhesive including acrylic acid polymer or polyurethane polymers is expected to be able to permanently bond to the first and

Art Unit: 1615

second non-adhesive substrates, absence of claiming amounts of the adhesive in the middle layer.

Regarding the new claims 66-68, the reference does not teach that the thickness of the article changes, therefore, it is constant.

### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments filed 03/26/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that US '928 does not teach adhesive matrix and the middle layer disclosed by the reference to contain acrylic and polyurethane is not disclosed as permanent adhesive. Further, applicant argues that the reference does not teach coating the adhesive layer on non-adhesive layer as required by claim 27.

In response to these arguments, applicant's attention is directed to the scope of at least claim 1 that is article comprising two non-adhesive layers sandwiching an adhesive matrix. US '928 clearly teaches two non-adhesive layers made from the same material as claimed by applicant' and sandwiching in between a layer comprising acrylic acid, polyurethane, and PVP. The same polymer materials are expected to have properties as adhesiveness and tackiness. As far as the limitation of "permanently bounded", examiner notes that it is conceivable to break apart any two substances which are bounded together, however, US '928's invention does not require, nor does it cause to happen, the breaking apart of the layers. Thus, the layers are deemed to be permanently bounded. With regard to claim 27, the reference teaches method of making the article comprises the steps of adding the therapeutic composition to the first

Art Unit: 1615

substrate then placing the second substrate on the first substrate, and placing and coating are equivalent in absence of specific coating methods or techniques.

It is well established that the claims are given the broadest interpretation during examination. A conclusion of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) does not require absolute predictability, only a reasonable expectation of success; and references are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosure. *In re Bozek*, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969).

In the light of the foregoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the claims would have been prima facie obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a).

11. Claims 19-26, 28-30, 35, 45, 46, 53, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US '928 in view of US 5,350,581 ('581).

The teachings of US '928 are discussed above.

US '928 suggested delivery of more than one active agent, and suggested to keep the different active ingredient separate.

However, US '928 does not teach more than one superimposed layers containing adhesive or pile of the article as claimed in claims 19-26, 28-30, 35, 45, 46, 53, and 58.

US '581 teaches multilayered transdermal therapeutic system assembled from superimposed monolithic unites to obtain the finished device (abstract). The device comprises more than one therapeutic agent contained in different adhesive matrices to deliver mixture of therapeutic agents (col.5, lines 30-55). The multilayered device has

improved reliability and is produced by manipulable steps (col.2, lines 33-38). Example of drugs to be delivered by the device anti-inflammatory drugs, ant-histaminic drugs, and vasodilators (col.5, lines 58-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide an article comprising two non-adhesive layers and a middle layer disposed in between the non-adhesive layers and comprises adhesive and therapeutic agent wherein more than one active agents can be enclosed separate from one another in the article as disclosed by US '928, and provide the different active agent in more than one superimposed adhesive layers as disclosed by US '581, motivated by the teaching of US '581 that multilayered device has improved reliability and is produced by manipulable steps, and deliver mixture of beneficial therapeutic agents, with reasonable expectation of having article comprising two non-adhesive layers and a middle layer disposed in between the non-adhesive layers and comprises multiple layers comprises adhesive and different therapeutic agent wherein more than one active agents can be delivered from improved reliable device.

### ***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's arguments filed 03/26/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that US '581 does not cure the deficiencies of US '928 with regard to the independent claims.

In response to this argument, US '928 makes the independent claims obvious as set forth in section 10 of this office action. US '581 is relied upon for the solely teaching

Art Unit: 1615

of multiple layered articles and piles that are known in the art. The test for obviousness is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In this case one having ordinary skill in the art would have provided the different active agent in more than one superimposed adhesive layers in the article of US '928 as disclosed by US '581, motivated by the teaching of US '581 that multilayered device has improved reliability and is produced by manipulable steps, and deliver mixture of beneficial therapeutic agents, with reasonable expectation of having article comprising two non-adhesive layers and a middle layer disposed in between the non-adhesive layers and comprises multiple layers comprises adhesive and different therapeutic agent wherein more than one active agents can be delivered from improved reliable device.

13. Claim 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US '928 in view of US 6,338,839 ('839).

The teachings of US '928 are discussed above.

US '928 teaches polyamide in the therapeutic composition.

However, the US '928 does not teach the polyamide in the powder form.

US '839 teaches topical cosmetic composition that has transfer resistance from the skin to the surfaces it comes in contact with (abstract; col.2, lines 17-20, 30-35). The composition comprises Orgasol which is polyamide powder (col.5, lines 4, 49-58).

Art Unit: 1615

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide an article comprising two non-adhesive layers and a middle layer disposed in between the non-adhesive layers and comprises therapeutic composition containing active agent and polyamide, as disclosed by US '928, and replace polyamide with polyamide powder as disclosed by US '839, motivated by the teaching of US '839 that composition comprising this powder has transfer resistance of the active agent from the skin to the surfaces it comes in contact with, with reasonable expectation of having an article comprising two outer layers and middle layer comprising active agent and polyamide powder wherein the active agent has transfer resistance on application to skin.

### ***Response to Arguments***

14. Applicant's arguments filed 03/26/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that US '839 does not cure the deficiencies of US '928 with regard to the independent claims.

In response to this argument, US '928 makes the independent claims obvious as set forth in section 10 of this office action. US '839 is relied upon for the sole teaching of polyamide in form of powder that is known in the art. The test for obviousness is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In this case one having ordinary skill in the art would have included polyamide powder in the article of US '928 as disclosed by US '839, motivated by the teaching of US '839 that

Art Unit: 1615

composition comprising this powder has transfer resistance of the active agent from the skin to the surfaces it comes in contact with, with reasonable expectation of having an article comprising two outer layers and middle layer comprising active agent and polyamide powder wherein the active agent has transfer resistance on application to skin.

15. Claims 12, 13, 61-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US '928 in view of JP 04108710 ('710).

The teachings of US '928 are discussed above, however US '928 does not teach magnetizable particles in the therapeutic composition.

JP '710 teaches cosmetic in adhesive matrix comprising magnetizable particles that are capable of promoting of blood flow to the skin without causing inflammation to the skin (abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide an article comprising two non-adhesive layers and a middle layer disposed in between the non-adhesive layers and comprises adhesive and therapeutic agent as disclosed by US '928, and add magnetizable particles to the active agent containing layer as disclosed by JP '710, motivated by the teaching of JP '710 that the magnetizable particles are capable of promoting the blood flow to the skin without causing its inflammation, with reasonable expectation of having an article comprising two outer layers and middle adhesive layer comprising magnetizable particles that promotes the blood flow to the skin without causing its inflammation.



***Response to Arguments***

16. Applicant's arguments filed 03/26/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that JP '710 does not cure the deficiencies of US '928 with regard to the independent claims.

In response to this argument, US '928 makes the independent claims obvious as set forth in section 10 of this office action. JP '710 is relied upon for the sole teaching of inclusion of magnetic particles in therapeutic formulations that is known in the art. The test for obviousness is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In this case one having ordinary skill in the art would have included magnetic particles in the article of US '928 as disclosed by JP '710, motivated by the teaching of JP '710 that the magnetizable particles are capable of promoting the blood flow to the skin without causing its inflammation, with reasonable expectation of having an article comprising two outer layers and middle adhesive layer comprising magnetizable particles that promotes the blood flow to the skin without causing its inflammation.

***Conclusion***

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isis A. Ghali whose telephone number is (571) 272-0595. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on (571) 272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 1615

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Isis A Ghali  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1615

IG

*is Ghali*

ISIS GHALI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER